

Vol. 10 No. 4

December, 1988

THE STAR OF THE EAST



الْمَجْدُ الْمُبِينُ

an ecumenical journal dealing specially with
the oriental and eastern orthodox churches

THE STAR OF THE EAST

ଶ୍ରୀ ପ୍ରାଚୀ ପାତ୍ର

An ecumenical journal dealing specially with
the Oriental and Eastern Orthodox Churches

THE DELHI ORTHODOX CENTRE
2, Tughlakabad Institutional Area
New Delhi-110 062

Vol. 10, No. 4

December 1988

CHIEF EDITOR

Dr. Paulos Mar Gregorios

EDITOR

Revd. Dr. K. M. George

EDITORIAL BOARD

H.G. Mathews Mar
Coorilos
H.G. Geevarghese Mar Osthathios
Revd. Fr. K. G. Thomas
Revd. Fr. T. J. Joshua
Mr. P. A. Oommen

H.G. Dr. Philipose Mar
Theophilos
Revd. Dr. V. C. Samuel
Revd. C. G. Geevarghese
Revd. Dr. M. Jacob Kurian
Mr. K. M. Mathew

EDITORIAL ADVISORS

Revd. Fr. Stewart, Cambridge Brotherhood, Delhi-6
Revd. Fr. Hambye S. J., Vidya Jyothi, Delhi-6
Very Revd. Archpriest Vitaly Borovoi
Revd. Fr. Ion Bria, W. C. C., Geneva

BUSINESS MANAGER

Revd. George Paulose

CONTENTS

	Page
1. Editorial	1
2. Indian Identity—Its Nature and Density —Dr. Paulos Mar Gregorios	3
3. Philosophy, God and Science —W. Crawford Knox	8
4. "Your will be done : Orthodoxy in Mission" Consultation of Eastern Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox Churches—Final Report	20

Editorial

1. Rising Problems

The *Star* has been having problems. It has noticeably failed to rise at set times. This seems to be the price of publishing a journal with only volunteer staff and no budget at all. As our Editor, Dr K. M. George has been in the process of moving from Delhi to Geneva, the last two issues have been inordinately delayed. Our most sincere apologies. We shall strive to do better in future.

2. God, World, Humanity

Prof. W. C. Knox raises in this issue some key questions about the need to bring Science, Philosophy and Religion together again. Knox questions, indirectly, the attempt to solve the problem by ignoring philosophical issues, and "adjusting" theology to current scientific knowledge. One remembers the wise dictum that a hasty marriage between religion and current science is bound to leave religion a widow (er) soon. For science keeps changing and what was 'scientific truth' yesterday often becomes obsolete archaism tomorrow. One look at some science text books of a generation ago will make this clear.

There are scientist-theologians who still try to fit the Christian doctrine of creation into the as yet "un-final" post-Darwinian theory of evolution, not worrying too much about the gaps and anomalies in that theory as it stands. They also fail to come to terms with the fact that "objective knowledge" of reality was a very mistaken objective in the first instance for science to pursue, since no such objective reality exists, as present physics has been telling us for half a century.

Knox takes the philosophical problem seriously to account. Others, notably successful in some quarters, like Peacocke and Nebelsick whom Knox cites, seem weak on this ontological aspect too-uncritically accepting Whiteheadian process philosophy's metaphysical assumptions. Knox openly attacks these assumptions; and puts forward his own theological-patristic perspective.

He sees clearly that the created order cannot be separate from or outside God, since the infinite, having no boundaries, cannot have an outside.

Knox also rightly locates the origin of the error in western Cosmology in Augustine of Hippo-who separated will and understanding, as well as Creator and creation. Knox wants to put the world back inside God.

Aye, there is the rub ! Is God space or extension, so that something can be inside him ? Is that not the problem with simplistic concepts like pan-theism and pan-en-theism ?

True, Knox tries to present us an alternative to the "non-quantum-physics" world which many would-be reconcilers of science and religion give us. In pointing out the anomalies in the prevailing western view of reality, Knox renders us a special favour.

He remains, however, in the same mistaken western framework, when he seems to presume to give us a quantum-physics evolutionary picture of reality that would be compatible with the Christian revelation. That revelation, as we Eastern Christians understand it, includes the proposition that there is no conceptual or mathematical paradigm that can picture the reality, either of God or of His Creation. The West still finds the apophatic tradition abhorrent. It is too sanguine about conceptuality's capacities.

INDIAN IDENTITY—ITS NATURE AND DESTINY

WHO ARE WE IN INDIA TODAY ?
WHO SHALL WE BECOME ?*

Dr. Paulos Gregorios

It becomes too much of a cliche to say that we in India are undergoing a severe identity crisis. But it is a fact that we have been in such a crisis for some time now. We may misunderstand the nature of the crisis, as well as the nature of the so-called secular identity that we are supposed to seek; but our uncertainty about our own identity shows through in the recent spate of communal out-breaks in our country, as well as in the erosion of the strength of the Congress Party in the South, the North-East and the Northwest of our country. Too many sectors of our population, including the majority community itself shows unwillingness to accept without qualification the secular identity bequeathed to us by Jawaharlal Nehru. We are fast moving towards a situation where all our political parties are regional rather than national, despite claims to the contrary.

It is in this context that this paper seeks to find avenues for agreement on the nature and destiny of Indian identity today. The present Indian nation, carved out in 1947 of what was British India for two centuries, is a totally new entity, with only 40 years of real history. Even the freedom struggle that preceded independence was a composite struggle of what now are three nations—India, Pakistan and Bangladesh. And none of the three has inherited the totality of that Indian heritage which belonged to us in common. In terms of variety and extent, the Indian

[*See the important work of Metropolitan Gregorios to be released soon : *Enlightenment : East and West—Pointers in the Quest for India's secular Identity*. Published by the Indian Institute of Advanced Study, Shimla with B.R. Publishing Corporation, Delhi. Review of the book will appear in a future issue of the *Star*, —Ed]

share is larger than that of the other two. But if we had stayed together our common heritage would have been substantially different from what it is in post-independence India.

Nevertheless, we should proceed to an analysis of what we are, and what we should plan to become, in the joint light of present day realities and the complex past we have inherited.

As for present realities, we live today at the confluence of two composite cultures—the one that our masses have inherited from our own chequered past, and the other which our educated elite have semi-assimilated from a more recently imported European culture. Both are composite cultures, and very complex cultures. There is no consensus in delineating the main contours of either culture. It is a dialogue towards that consensus that this paper seeks to initiate.

It is a consensus urgently needed, for it is our common identity that is at stake. On the road to that consensus we may encounter some solutions to phenomena like our growing communalism and the increasing alienation of our people from their rulers.

Europe and its Gift to Us

We have in the recent past picked up so many things from European civilisation that we tend sometimes to forget the extent of that borrowing: an educational system, a medical system, an industrial system, a system of political institutions, the liberal intellectual tradition and values, and the marxist way of perceiving and dealing with reality. Especially for our educated elite, this is the dominating system, the inherited system of our own culture being increasingly subordinated to it. The masses of our people cannot escape the impact of that system; but they manage to keep themselves less dominated by it.

What indeed is this Europe, that modest western promontary of our huge Asian continent? Let one of its most eloquent spokesmen, Denis de Rougemont of Switzerland tell us. One can seldom trust the Britisher to tell us what Europe is, for Britain's belong-

ing to Europe has always been half-hearted. Not so this erudite Swiss professor, this passionate prophet of Europe as the Creator of the World: (Denis de Rougemont, *The Meaning of Europe* Eng. Tr. Alan Braley, Sidgwick and Jackson, 1965, p. 11)

"I wish to speak to you about Europe, not as a cause to defend or a larger homeland to glorify, but as *an adventure of decisive significance for the whole of mankind*. By Europe, I mean that part of the world which *made* "the World", since it was in Europe that the idea of "the human race" was born; in fact Europe was the *sine qua non* of a truly universal history."

Those were the opening words of a four-lecture series in the *stadium generale* in the University of Geneva in 1962. He continued:

"The central thesis of the four lectures in the series is *this definition of Europe in functional terms as the creator of the world*".

The professor gave his three reasons for making such bold claims:

1. Europe discovered the whole of the earth, and nobody ever came and discovered Europe.
2. Europe has held sway on all the continents in succession, and up till now has never been ruled by any foreign power.
3. Europe has produced a civilisation which is being imitated by the whole world, whilst the converse has never happened." (*ibid* p. 12)

We shall not stop here to dispute the professor's claims, except perhaps one, that the idea of "the human race" was born in Europe. It is more important for us here to sense Europe's own self-understanding. We in India know that thousands of years before the professor spoke, the *Purushasukta* of the *Rgveda* had laid out the contours of cosmic man, and the *Bhumisukta* of the *Atharvaveda* had seen one human race composed of five sub-races living in unity on one earth. Perhaps Europe still dreams of

another kind of human race, one that is led by Europe. Let that be.

What is the essential nature of this Europe? De Rougemont gives us an interesting formula to understand Europe, as "adventure and expansion", the two key words that characterise her inner nature. Europa in the Greek myth is a West Asian Princess, the daughter of Agenor, King of Tyre (Syria), abducted by Zeus, the god of the Greeks. This is true in history too it seems. Denis de Rougemont himself tells us that Europe was civilized "by the effect of a succession of intellectual, technical and religious contributions which had their origin in Egypt, Mesopotamia and Phoenicia and were transferred thence first to Crete, then via the Aegean Sea to Greece, and from there to the countries of the west, known in semitic language as *Ereb*, which very probably is the derivation of the name Europe" (*ibid* p. 17). European civilisation, as well as the civilising peoples of Europe came originally from Asia and Africa, from an adventurous people always willing to explore and face new situations.

Let us try to understand Europe as "adventure and expansion" originating in Asia and Africa, but let us see behind that adventurous expansion also an enormous capacity to dominate and devour. By devouring Europe expanded, and she still does, to this day. The pace and quantity of her devouring has gone up as she has grown up and become a mature and rapacious wild animal. In the beginning the devouring was gentle and slow, as in the days of Alexander, for example, in the 4th century B.C. Before that already during the Classical Period of Greek civilisation (5th century B.C. to third quarter of 4th century B.C.) it was mostly ideas that Pythagoras and Plato devoured, and no harm was done to anyone. Those ideas came from everywhere in Asia, from Persia and India, from Akkadia and Sumeria, from Babylonia and Judea. The Classical Greek alphabet itself was dependent on the Hebrew alphabet. Greeks took over the myths and legends of the Phoenicians and the Hittites and transformed them into their own. By the time the Pythagorean school develops in the 6th century B.C., they have heard about Buddha and Mahavira, and perhaps also of Confucius and Lao Tse, as well as the Hebrew prophets of the 8th century B.C. and before. Herodotus

(ca 484—ca 420 BC) tells us of Skylax of Caria, the Greek sea captain whom Persian King Darius (522—486 B.C.) employed to explore the course of the Indus (Herodotus, *Persian Wars* IV : 44; Aristotle refers to it two centuries later *Politics* vii : 14). Skylax the European sailed down the Indus river and visited many parts of India, and probably wrote an account of his travels which Aristotle and Plutarch used, but which has not come down to us.

By the time the 4th century comes around, contacts between India and Europe are more frequent. Aristoxenos of Tarent (fl. late 4th century B.C.), contemporary and disciple of Aristotle, tells us the story of Socrates meeting in Athens an Indian who asked the Greek sage what sort of philosophy he practised (Eusebius : *Praeparatio Evangelica* XI.3.28). Alexander's invasion of India marks the beginning of a new period of intense contact between India and Greece, which we need to study in greater detail if we are to overcome our Europhobia. Only such a study can begin to show us how much even our classical Indian culture owes to the Europeans, especially the Greeks. And in recognising the extent of that debt, we can learn to see that almost all cultures in human history have been influenced by other cultures and that no culture actually grows up in a vacuum. That vision seems eminently necessary if we are to overcome our parochial prejudices about the culture that our ancestors have bequeathed to us. Indian culture was never so purely Swadeshi as sometimes our savants tell us.

It is high time the best minds in India set themselves to undertake this great and urgent task of finding out who we Indians are. That effort may first divide, but will eventually help unite us.

PHILOSOPHY, GOD AND SCIENCE

—W. Crawford Knox, Oxford—

I want in this talk to raise the question whether the separation of theology and science which is one mark of the current thought, really does reflect the relationship of God to the world or whether it is the product of the way in which, over the centuries, we have come to think of God and the world and their relationship. In other words, is the separation of theology and science a conceptual artefact?

Now for reasons that will become clear, any attempt to justify such a suggestion and to seek an alternative way of thinking about God and the world must range widely and deeply and in the course of half an hour I can at best point to certain relevant arguments, rather than attempting to set them out at all fully. Fuller arguments, which will, I hope, be published in due time, approach the subject from three angles: they seek first to show how historically the situation has arisen; secondly, they point to certain critical issues on which current understandings are questionable; and thirdly, they point to some aspects of an alternative view. That alternative view is broadly that held by the New Testament writers, notably Paul and John, and the early Church Fathers, notably the Alexandrian and Cappadocian Fathers. In particular, I shall point to some of the changes introduced to their view by Augustine who was largely responsible for setting the mould in which Western thinking was to develop. In large measure, we shall be considering the working out of the implications of his changes and the problems to which they have given rise.

It is unnecessary for me to describe how Jewish and Greek thinking came together to provide a framework of thought within which the life, death, resurrection and ascension of Jesus Christ came to be understood. The only point that needs to be stressed

is that, despite the contrary view of many commentators, as was shown some sixty years ago by George Foote Moore and has recently been reiterated by E P Sanders, the Jews of the time of Jesus had a strong sense of the intimate presence of the divine throughout their lives. This was carried forward by the early Church with a strong sense of the mutual indwelling: of the Father in the Son; of the Son in man and in creation; of creation and man in the Son and the Son in the Father: of life in Christ and so of creation within the life of God. The early Fathers constantly use phrases such as, 'enclosing, not enclosed'. The early understanding of the Trinity was in keeping with this. Broadly, the Father was God transcendent, and the divine Son, the Word or Logos, the divine Christ, the principle of reason and order, and the Holy Spirit, the divine energy and love, were those aspects of his nature and so his instruments which fashioned the world. Thus for Irenaeus they were the two hands of the Father, embracing, structuring, energising and guiding the world: We have, I believe, to take this structuring and energising work quite literally: God was not only transcendent; he was present in the world, not as some form of passive ground, but dynamically structuring and energising it. I shall suggest just how literally we need to take this presently. Meanwhile, if you want some kind of 'picture' of this, think of a boundless lake in which a whirlpool develops spontaneously: the whirlpool is in the water and the water is in the whirlpool. If you want to press the analogy, the Word or Son is giving it form and the Spirit is energising it. Again, the form is in the water and the water is in the form: the form in the whirlpool and the whirlpool in the form: and similarly with the Spirit.

It is important for me to distinguish this position from, for instance, that of Whitehead and the Process theologians who also believe in creation 'within' the life of God. Professor Nebelsick [Theology and Science in Mutual Modification p 50] quotes from Whitehead's 'Process and Reality'; I break the quotation into parts so that I can comment on each.

'It is as true to say that the world is immanent in God, as God is immanent in the world.' Yes: the New Testament says just that.

'It is as true to say that God transcends the world as that the world transcends God.' No : in no way can the world transcend God on whom it utterly depends.

'It is as true to say that God creates the world as that the world creates God.' No : the world adds nothing to God that does not derive from God : the world creates only in the sense that it realises in its life aspect of the life of God that are eternally features of his life.

I hope these points distinguish the position of the New Testament and early Church writers, and so my own position, from that of Whitehead or any other 'deus sive natura' theology. In no way can the world limit God and the early Patristic understanding thus allows for the fullest depths of God's transcendence. When I am so distinguishing, it may be helpful if I distinguish also my own position from a more central Western view. I can do so by quoting a comment by Professor Nebelsick [*op cit* p 52] which again I break into parts. 'Neither for Cobb nor for Whitehead is God the transcendent personal creator who creates 'ex nihilo' and whose creation is substantially separate from but contingent upon him.. The early Fathers also are, of course, talking of God as the transcendent personal creator : subject to the need to distinguish 'personal' from 'a person' we are at one on this. 'Who creates "ex nihilo", Yes, here too we agree, at least on the words. But very different pictures could be at issue here. The early Fathers are talking about creation as an ordering and energising process 'within' the life of God, from a state of deepest possible disorder and alienation from God to the full realisation of the order of creation within his life. Many modern theologians, however, seem to think in terms of some kind of materialisation, presumably in a void : though how there can be a void if God is infinite is not explained. The third part of that sentence is : 'Whose creation is substantially separate from God.' No : what can separate us from God if God is simple and if we are totally dependent on him? In so far as we exist at all we are sustained by the divine Christ and the Father : we are, as it were embedded in God. Perhaps we may distinguish warping and alienation from 'separation'. And finally the reference to creation 'contingent' upon God. Again we

must distinguish. There can be no contingency in God - in the origin of the creativity of God in God - for we are speaking of the life and work of the Son and Spirit. But there is contingency in its term or outcome in creation, for inherent in the creativity of God is freedom to deviate from his life - and that is the root of sin. But in speaking of the contingency of creation, many modern theologians have, I think, in mind the idea of God's 'choosing' whether and in what form to create : but that brings the contingency into the nature of God and on this I comment later.

I hope I have said enough to mark out the position of the New Testament and early Church Fathers—and so my own position—so I want now to point briefly to some of the changes in that understanding that took place subsequently in Western theology. The fundamental changes were made by Augustine. With him, the picture of God enclosing, not enclosed, and of creation within the life of God changed. For Augustine, the Trinity became internal to the life of God, known only by revelation, and creation moved outside his life-creation "ad extra". What is more, the creative powers of God in Christ were separated from his redemptive powers. As Claus Westermann in that profound little book, 'Creation', makes clear, the creation of man in God's image and likeness means that image and likeness are inherent in being man, regardless of creed or colour, faith or belief or revelation - which is not to say it can't be marred - and redemption is the other side of that same act by which God seeks to lead men home.

The importance of these changes can hardly be overestimated. From the time of Augustine there has been in Western theology and Western thought no longer one order - the order of God - but two orders, natural and supernatural. Another change reflects this separation : for the early Fathers, God's will reflected God's nature : there was nothing other than God; so God was completely free; but God being eternal, his nature and so his will were, naturally, completely unchanging. Similarly, man's will reflected man's understanding though it was the product of his weak and incompletely developed personality. But Augustine separated man's will from 'his understanding' and his other

attributes, and though he retained the immutability of God, in effect he jettisoned the even-handedness of God and showed him as arbitrarily selective, albeit that this was planned eternally. The full separation of the will from the nature of God had, however, to await the later Middle Ages. Yet, although in such ways Augustine had separated God and creation - and I must stress that above is still a separation, indeed, above is still alongside - he continued to see God and creation as extremely close, so that, as I shall note, for the entire Augustinian tradition, at least up to the time of Bonaventure, when one penetrated the depths of the mind, one reached up to God—something that was to change under the influence of the recovered works of Aristotle.

Things moved very slowly for some centuries after Augustine but by the year 1067 we find Peter Damiani considering a letter from Jerome where Jerome had said that not even God could restore a fallen virgin. Jerome's concern was moral but Damiani's was with the limitation it implied on the powers of God. Nonetheless, Anselm, not much later, was stoutly defending the traditional position: what God did was the best possible and could not be changed for any change could only be for the worse. It was Abelard who precipitated the issue. He claimed that God had in his nature to choose the best so that choice did not arise for God: but as he failed to distinguish the world as it is, marred by sin and evil, from the world as God willed it, at the Council of Sens in 1140 the Church condemned his view and held that God could choose. That has been the position of most Western theologians since.

That faced succeeding theologians with a problem. Aquinas distinguished the absolute powers of God, taken in isolation from his other attributes, to do whatever he wished from his ordained powers which related to his full attributes and so to what he actually did. The absolute powers were thus completely theoretical: but within a short time usage had slipped. The ordained powers were being regarded as the normal powers of God deployed in sustaining the world and the absolute powers came into play with his supernatural interventions. By now the will of God was being separated from his nature and was taking precedence. God's will was being seen as totally unfettered,

even by reason. Thus when, as a result of these developments, the world came to be seen as the product of God's choice, a kind of rubber joint was being placed between God and the world: henceforward, howsoever men saw the world, that must be the way God chose to make it. One could no longer reason from the nature of God to the nature of the world or vice versa. What is more, the world was no longer seen as the product of the Ideas of God which were a feature of order of the Divine Christ: contingency had thus been introduced into the very life of God and, by an implication rarely if ever drawn, the Divine Christ had been dethroned and separated from the Father. Indeed, the very mind of God, that zone between the transitoriness of this world and the transcendence of the Father, was dropping out of sight with consequences on which I comment later. This gradual detachment of the world from God had, of course, also been emphasised by the emerging influence of Aristotle. For the entire Augustinian tradition, at least up to the time of Bonaventure, when, as I have noted, one penetrated to the depths of the mind, one found God: for Aquinas and his successors, when one penetrated the depths of the mind, one found only the depths of the mind. God was only causally related to the world: so much so that God did not see things in the world in themselves but only their resemblance. What is more, whereas for Bonaventure, the forms coming to the senses were given sensuous clothing by divine illumination, for Aquinas, the senses were the sole source of knowledge. Thus on a very wide front the natural was coming to be separated from the supernatural and was increasingly acquiring autonomy.

I cannot attempt here to chart the subsequent ways in which the concepts of God and the world moved further apart, purpose moved from the world into the mind and God came increasingly to be seen as concerned mainly with the inward self. Professor Nebelsick has done this very helpfully in his book 'Theology and Science in Mutual Modification'. The Reformers, notably Calvin, did much to emphasise that separation with their stress on the sinfulness of the world and the utter transcendence of God. By the time of Descartes, there were two orders: the purely mechanical order of nature and the order of the mind that had everything left over. But even for Descartes, God had

constantly to maintain everything in existence. For the eighteenth century deists even that role vanished and by the nineteenth century, following the separation by Kant of the natural and moral orders, God was becoming 'a person'. What had started in the Middle Ages as a concern to emphasise the supremacy of God by making the world an optional extra for him, had turned over and God had become an optional extra for the world. Materialism was what was left when God was evacuated from it. Yet in so far as materialism was identified with the scientific understanding of the world and mind was seen as a by-product of it, it was and is a completely metaphysical theory, unfalsifiable even by yet more experiences. (I prefer my own theology to be falsifiable against experience and so to be scientific.)

The position we have arrived at can be illustrated briefly by Professor Swinburne's definition of God as 'something like a person without a body (ie. a spirit) who is eternal, free, able to do anything, knows everything, is perfectly good, is the proper object of human worship and obedience, the creator and sustainer of the universe.' *[The Coherence of Theism p 8.]*

I hope, therefore, I have brought out the enormous conceptual changes that have taken place over the centuries, largely unconsciously, as each generation has accepted the ideas of its elders and mentors and developed their implications. We can summarise those changes by saying that modern theology is concerned largely with God as a simple person and with his 'external' relationships with the world whereas the earlier picture involved the exploration of the inner dynamics of the plenitude of God. God and the world are today largely exclusive concepts: in the earlier picture, God included the world. If one wanted to speak of God transcendent, one usually spoke of the Father. Yet these vast changes took place despite almost unwavering and sincere adherence to the same creeds and to the same Scriptures. It is a startling commentary on the unspoken power of frameworks of thought, of paradigms. It is perhaps not surprising if by now the New Testament understandings have been substantially lost and Western theology contains what I believe to be some radical weaknesses and even incoherences. I shall simply list some of them.

(1) The very idea of creation 'outside' the life of God and of the Trinity as 'internal' to it: something against which Rahner has vigorously protested, How can one get outside an infinite God?

(2) The understanding of creation 'ex nihilo' as some kind of materialisation in a void as against an ordering within the life of God. How can there be a void if there is an infinite God?

(3) The conceptual separation of the will from the nature of God: this must surely break the divine simplicity and divide God.

(4) The idea of God's 'choosing'. This, too, splits the divine simplicity and, in any event, choice implies limitation.

(5) A conceptual separation of the nature of God conceived in static terms, from his creativity, conceived as some kind of 'optional extra'.

(6) A serious failure, I believe, to face the limitations on the powers of God implied in the very plenitude of his creative nature—in other words, a failure to face the full implications of the limits of self-contradiction.

(7) A conceptual separation of the creative powers of God in Christ from his redemptive powers: indeed, we have almost lost sight of Christ as the creative Word of God and have substituted some kind of picture of a risen man in some way redeeming through the Cross.

These almost unquestioned features of the Western picture with the profound dualisms embedded in it, has resulted in quite surprising uses of the word 'pantheism' applied to anything that does not fit the Western picture. Not surprisingly, these different understandings have radical implications for the understanding of the Incarnation which I shall touch on later. And, as a kind of spin-off of all this, there are, I believe, serious failures in our picture of the relationship of the physical world to God; both in recognising the extent of the penetration of sin, right into the very nature of matter; and in understanding evolution in terms of the progressive revelation of the attributes of God as the world

assimilates itself to and develops within the divine Christ, the Logos.

Now I have sought to show the non-rational way in which the split between theology and science has developed and to suggest some weaknesses in the resulting theological understandings. Clearly, however, that is not enough if I am to make credible the idea that the separation of science and theology is a conceptual artefact. It is necessary also to be able at least to point to positive and, indeed, empirically falsifiable implications of the earlier theological position for our modern science-based understanding of the world. So I want in the last few minutes of my talk to point a few of those implications.

(1) We seem today to picture the physical world as if it was a kind of landscape spread out before us, changing in detail all the time, but recognisably enduring. We seem to forget that the physical exists only at the moment 'now' and that 'now' is constantly moving forward. In other words, we neglect the way in which our conceptual models enshrined in memory give these transitory experiences continuity. David Bohm has sought to encapsulate this transitoriness in his picture of an implicate order becoming explicate at the moment 'now' and then becoming implicate again; and of the ordinary physical world understood in terms of evolving standing patterns in that unfolding process. I find it helpful to think of the physical world in terms of such standing patterns in a wave of energy that is crossing the mind of God and acting as a kind of processor which, as it rolls forward, is continuously establishing systems, and in particular human beings, which as it falls away live on in the eternal mind of God. But if this point is taken, then that zone of the eternal life of God that contains this transitory world, must contain also past and future: God cannot forget.

(2) We today think of mind as a separate substance, as, indeed, has theology since the time of Aquinas. We tend to think of mind as if it were contained in the head and linked with other minds only by the senses. We have lost any picture of the mind as rooted back into the mind of God to which it is intrinsically open. One major key to this understanding of the relationship

lies, I believe, in memory and, even more controversially though the early Church Fathers would not have felt that, in psychic phenomena.

(3) We have recovered the idea of evolution as an ordering process from the random processes of the vacuum field and it is not difficult to envisage it in terms of the progressive manifestation of the attributes of God as order develops. Naturally, where the act of God is unguided by reason and by love, it deviates randomly, coming into existence as it comes into accordance with the will of God and passing out of existence as it deviates from it. As order develops, despite constant deviation, by a process of mutations and conceptual leaps, life emerges; then understanding, love, holiness and, at the culmination of the process when the mind becomes stilled and fully ordered, we come face to face with God in the mystical experience.

(4) More specifically, as part of this evolution into the life of God, we come to a deeper understanding of it and of our lives, not just by discursive reasoning but by those conceptual leaps - by openness to those conceptual insights - which are the mark of creativity alike in the sciences, the arts and in the spiritual life. These leaps are the 'gnosis' of the early Fathers which deepen our understanding and, at the same time, structure the mind at every level from infancy, as Piaget has shown: a process that leads it towards wholeness and maturity and makes it more transparent to the attributes and, more specifically, the will of God. Here lies the root of faith: natural and supernatural do not divide into two great zones: those insights interleave the rational at every point of life and at every stage in the development of the personality. The need for faith is thus a need for openness to insights and creativity.

(5) In line with this, we have lost sight of the fact that God cannot impose his attributes upon creation. We virtually ignore the limits of self-contradiction that flow from his very plenitude; yet I believe this holds the key to the form taken by the creativity of God and so to our understanding of our relationship with him. If creation is to evolve and develop to share in his attri-

butes and life, it has to do so entirely freely and only at the higher levels of order can it be guided by his reason and his love : below that it is largely blind and at the lowest levels random.

(6) As part of this picture, therefore, we have reduced and in some ways trivialised sin by making it a largely personal failing. We have failed to see that we are an integral part of a creation that deviates at every level and that God is seeking to bring the whole of creation into the order of his life. Deviation from his will is the very mark of the physical world as order develops out of disorder. I need to develop this point and as I am no scientist I again rely on Bohm. I quote first F E Simon : 'In a somewhat abbreviated way, one can say that all substances at absolute zero are in a state of perfect order - a state of affairs only possible in a quantum world. [Low Temperature Physics p 5] And Bohm says : 'According to the quantum theory, a crystal at absolute zero allows electrons to pass through it without scattering. They go through it as if the space were empty. If the temperature is raised, inhomogeneities appear, and these scatter electrons. If one were to use such electrons to observe the crystal... what would appear would be just the inhomogeneities. It would appear that the inhomogeneities exist independently and that the main body of the crystal was sheer nothingness.. And he goes on to say : 'It is being suggested here, then, that what we perceive through the senses as empty space is actually the plenum, which is the ground for the existence of everything, including ourselves. The things that appear to our senses are derivative forms and their true meaning can be seen only when we consider the plenum, in which they are generated and sustained and into which they must ultimately vanish.' [Wholeness and the Implicate Order pp 191-2].

It, then, we bear in mind the idea of creation within the life of God and how, as the idea of God has contracted to 'a person' out there, we have lost not only the sense of the immanence of God but also of that middle zone between this transitory world and the transcendence of the Father, Bohm's ideas appear to find a natural place in these theological terms as well, I assume, as one acceptable to physics. On this basis, therefore,

we no longer have three separate substances - spiritual, mental and physical - for both mental and physical are derivative from the spiritual : thus the ultimate nature of the world that God wills must develop through the physical to overcome the physical - to become fully ordered. Indeed, I press the point further : if we are to take seriously the growth and development of Jesus in accordance with the will of God and believe that he overcame sin, in the full sense of deviation from the will of God, then if Bohm is right, the tomb had to be empty.

This, then, is a falsifiable picture of the world : a non-quantum physics world, a non-evolutionary world, would make no sense within it. And it opens the way for a very different understanding of mind and particularly of memory from that current today : it opens the way also for a rational understanding of psychic phenomena and survival of death : it opens the way for a very different and, I believe, much more profound understanding of the creativity of the spiritual life and the Church : it opens the way for a reconciliation with other faiths, including Islam, which share a strong sense of the intimacy and accessibility of God : and perhaps above all, it restores to the understanding of Jesus Christ his former role as the Victor, the Illuminator and the Way to the Father.

“YOUR WILL BE DONE : ORTHODOXY IN MISSION”

CONSULTATION OF EASTERN ORTHODOX AND ORIENTAL ORTHODOX CHURCHES*

Neapolis, Greece, April 16—24, 1988

FINAL REPORT

I. WITNESSING IN THE OIKOUMENE TODAY

The Apostolic Witness

God offers salvation to all human beings of all eras without limitation or exception because God wants all to be saved and to come to the knowledge of truth (I Tim. 2:4). As a result of His unlimited love for humankind which submitted to evil, distortion and death by abusing the free will, God sent His only begotten Son “that whoever believes in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life” (John. 3:6).

Christ conquered sin and death, reconciled and granted peace to all things on earth and in heaven (cf. Col. 1:20), and granted the joy and the hope of the resurrection, which is the heart of the Christian message. “If Christ be not raised, our faith is in vain; you are yet in your sins” (I Cor. 15:17).

Christ ordered His disciples and apostles to proclaim the good news of salvation to all nations (Matt. 28:19), to the whole world and to all of creation (Mark 16:15) so that the salvific grace of Christ should be revealed to all who “sit in the darkness and the shadow of death” (Luke 1:79). The Apostles had to be and to become witnesses of all salvific events of Christ’s life (cf. Luke 24:48; Acts 10:39). The Apostles considered this very witness to be their main mission. In replacing Judas they elected someone who, like them, was a witness to Christ’s resurrection (Acts 1:22). Preaching the resurrection, they assured all that they were its witnesses (Acts 3-16). They could not avoid the obligation to

*Representing the Malankara Orthodox Church, H G. Philipose Mor Eusebius and Rev. Dr. K.M. George Participated in this consultation.

proclaim all they had seen and all they had heard (Acts 4:20) because the joy of such an experience is only “fulfilled” when it is shared and transmitted to others so that they also might become communicants and participants (I John 1:4).

The Orthodox Church, through the centuries until today, offers her apostolic witness to the crucified, buried and resurrected Christ. This same witness is offered by Christian mission today in the midst of the difficult conditions of secularization, pluralism, other faiths and ideologies.

Witness in a Secular World

The mission of the Church has cosmic dimensions. Its aim is to embrace and to renew the whole world, to transfigure it into God’s Kingdom. Mission is to approach and draw near, to sanctify and to renew the world, to give new content to old ways of life, to accept local cultures and their ways of expression that do not contradict the Christian faith, transforming them into means of salvation.

In the first centuries of her existence, the Church managed to transfigure the visage of the oikoumene in spite of the resistance of the world, which attempted to conform the Church to the world. To these tendencies of secularization, the Church responded by : entering into dialogue with Greek philosophy and pagan culture, which resulted in the production of creative theological patristic literature; intensifying the ascetic elements of the Christian life of her communities and monasteries as a new means of martyria; and expanding and enriching her worship. Within the boundaries of liturgical life the Church sanctified the activities and creative talents of human beings in all forms of art (literature, architecture, painting, music).

The Christian message is proclaimed not only by the use of words and by listening but through all the senses. In Orthodox worship, the entire human being participates with the soul and body, mind and heart, hearing, smelling and touching. The icons, incense, the embrace of peace, the partaking of the eucharistic bread and wine enrich and fulfil the teaching and the preaching.

Education is more successful when influenced by the good news of salvation and a life in Christ whose principal components are asceticism and eschatological expectation. Ascesis, as a voluntary withdrawal from a consumerist enjoyment of material goods, together with the desire to offer these goods to the poor and the needy, makes the passion and the cross of Christ more conscious in the life of Christians.

Mission is closely related to ascesis. The Thessalonian Saints, for example, Cyril and Methodios, before departing for Moravia, planned their missionary program and prepared themselves in a monastery of Olympos in Bithinia. Their missionary team was composed of priests, deacons, monks and lay persons. Also, from the Saints of the Oriental Orthodox (Non-Chalcedonian) family, seven monks left the monastery of St Minas in Egypt, formed a mission and evangelized Ireland. Their relics are still to be found in Belimina (near Belfast). Christian mission in Switzerland has been greatly affected by St Verena, from Egypt. In all Orthodox countries, monasteries assisted in the proclamation and witness of the Christian message.

Unfortunately, in recent centuries, especially following the Enlightenment and the French Revolution, the Christian message was gradually marginalized and humanism became an autonomous anthropology leading to atheism. In such a context, links with the Church are severed and the principles of state ideologies and education, as well as consumerism, dominate, satisfying industrial ambitions both in the East and the West. Secularization torments Christian communities in the whole world because the task of different ideologies is to separate human beings from the influence of the Church. This separation is caused by destructive forces against the Church, thus diminishing the Church's diakonia in the world.

Some, then, who are not satisfied with secularized society turn not to Christianity but to eastern cults. Islam, in confronting secularization, often turns to a more conservative lifestyle; the reaction to western humanism sometimes leads to an extreme theocracy, which demeans any human being.

The abundance of material goods and economic conformism, dechristianized state power and education, the lack of Christian perspective in the mass-media, the weakness of the family in exercising Christian pedagogical work and the diminishing of the spiritual and apostolic role of motherhood leads to secularism. The contradiction between words and deeds in the life of Christians further contributes to the development of a secular way of life.

Nevertheless, many human beings continue to be attracted to Orthodox Christianity through its asceticism and mysticism, the joy of the resurrection in its worship, the presence of ascetics and saints, and the proof through holiness that Christians are not conformed to the world (cf. Rom. 12:2; I Pet. 1:14).

Witness within a pluralistic society and among believers of other faiths

Today, Christianity is in a situation similar to that of the apostolic era when it faced syncretism and different philosophies or religions. A pluralistic world brings Christianity into confrontation and dialogue with other teachings and faiths. Despite intolerance and fanaticism, Christians can use the immense potential offered by contemporary technology to witness to and evangelize others, to lead them in Christ's way. Christianity sees in a positive way the creative work of human beings when it leads to the uplifting of humanity and to the glory of God. Understanding the cultural particularities of the evangelized, we must speak their own language, respond with love to both spiritual and material deprivation and bring life and brilliance to each eucharistic community. The love we owe to those of other faiths makes more imperative our duty to confirm, as did the early Christian Apologists, whatever truth may be found in them while affirming the fullness and authenticity of the salvific truth of Christianity, even under pressure of persecution. The Orthodox Churches, continuing the apostolic witness, have given tangible proof of endurance through the cloud of witnesses and new martyrs.

The awareness of the real needs of other people in this world

helps us in the fulfilment of our missionary work and diakonia. Here, the basic missionary principle does not lose its eternal significance for a consistent and holy Christian life, which impresses and is beneficial to the awakening of those outside the Church. In the midst of peoples and cultures where Christians live with all other persons, mission in Christ's way ought to lead towards sanctity of life, as an early Christian text of the second century states :

"Christians are not distinguished from others because of their homelands, their languages and their customs. Moreover, they do not live in separate towns, neither do they use a different dialect... However, while living in Greek and barbarian (non-Greek) cities, following the indigenous customs pertaining to clothing, food, and lifestyle, they provide an admirable and extraordinary way of life" (*Epistle to Diognetus*, 5).

II. MISSION AND UNITY

Ecclesiological Perspectives

The Apostolic community was gathered into one body by the Holy Spirit in the power and joy of the resurrection (cf. John 20:22). Members of this community were called to be witnesses to the risen Christ "to the ends of the earth" (Acts 1:8). The ground of unity of the Church, the Body of Christ, is the love and unity eternally manifested in the life of the Holy Trinity. The Church, as the presence of the Kingdom of God, is called to manifest this trinitarian communion and love within its fold and towards the world. The Church's mission is the expression of this unity and love.

God's love for the world is manifested in the incarnation of the Word of God (John 1:1), in the supreme sacrifice on the cross and in the power of the resurrection. It was His mission from the Father, the accomplishment of His will (cf. Luke 22:42; Jonh. 5:30). The Church, as the Body of Christ, is called to this missionary act of self-giving sacrifice and to proclaim the good news of salvation to the world.

In the eucharistic celebration every local church experiences

the fullness of the Church Catholic and prepares itself to address the world through words and deeds of love. The Church gathers into one body the whole creation and the joy and the sufferings of all people as it stands in the presence of God in the eucharistic act of praise, thanksgiving and intercession. This inward movement of gathering into one body is accompanied by the outward movement of going forth in mission and service to God's creation. Together, these movements constitute the Church's witness to the crucified and risen Christ in whom the unity and the love of the Triune God is manifested in a unique way.

Common Witness

In the Church's "ecclesial" (*ek-kalô*) movement of calling out, incorporating and building up process, the following major aspects are necessary for its realization today :

- (1) As Eastern Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox (Non-Chalcedonian) Churches, we need to fully restore the unity in communion of our two families of Churches. While we gratefully acknowledge the steps recently taken by our Churches towards coming together in mutual love and communion in the one apostolic faith, we wish to emphasize the urgency of the matter for our common witness today. We need to reaffirm our unity in faith above all historic, ethnic, racial, linguistic, national or political loyalties.
- (2) As active members of the wider ecumenical family of Churches, we pray and work for the unity of all in accordance with the will of God expressed in the high-priestly prayer of our Lord. It is our special mission to witness to the apostolic faith of the one undivided Church as all churches seek to grow more and more in "one Lord, one faith and one baptism".
- (3) It is God's oikoumene that is the wider context of our unity. Our theological and spiritual heritage is filled with the cosmic dimension of God's salvation. Nothing in the created realm is excluded from this sanctifying and

transfiguring power of the Spirit of God. As the liturgical experience shows, the one eucharistic bread stands at the same time for the one Church and the totality of creation that we offer to God in thanksgiving. While joyfully celebrating the marvellous gift of creation, we have to commit ourselves to humanity's struggles for human dignity, justice and peace. As Orthodox Churches, we can witness to the integrity of creation by dedicating ourselves to acts of healing, reconciling, enlightening and saving.

The outgoing ("processional") movement of the Church's witness is what we usually call mission. This mission of the Church has several points of reference, such as the eternal unity in the Triune God, unity between the divine and human in the incarnate Word of God and the unity between Christ, the head of the Church and the Church His Body. All these dimensions of unity are constitutively qualified by love. The same divine love is the motivating power behind the sending of the Son by the Father and the mission of the Comforter Spirit to the Church. Thus, the mission of the Church is in fact an outreaching processional movement of unity and love.

Therefore, the Church, the people of God in the communion of the Holy Spirit, is missionary in her very being, ever proceeding and ever gathering, pulsating with God's all-embracing love and unity. The Church, as the presence of the Kingdom of God in the world, illuminates in one single reality the glory of God and the eschatological destiny of creation.

The missionary character of the Church is expressed in diverse ways and forms : liturgical witness to the transcendent dimension of reality, direct evangelistic witness, witness in secular and pluralistic situations, witness through prayer and asceticism, witnessing the life-giving gospel to the poor and oppressed, witness through committed sharing of the struggle for justice and peace, etc. These are some of the expressions of the outreaching movement of the Church's mission.

The constitutive character of mission as the expression of

unity calls for a common witness. The situation of our world makes it imperative that what the Churches can do together they should not do separately. The search for a common witness helps the Churches to come out of their parochial loyalties and encourages them to seek together God's will for our contemporary world.

The Orthodox Churches, living in diverse cultures, challenged by their socio-political, economic and linguistic situations, are called upon to engage in a common witness to the one apostolic faith in Christ in new missionary situations. By responding to these challenges creatively and in the unity of Spirit, without catering to the narrow interests of each Church, the Churches are responding to the will of God.

A serious effort towards creating Orthodox missionary centres and a global missionary strategy will inspire and enable our local Orthodox Churches not only to witness along with other Orthodox Churches, but also to contribute substantially, from the Orthodox perspective, to other Christian Churches engaged in similar forms of witness.

Proselytism

Proselytism, along with the actual disunity among the Churches, creates major obstacles for our common witness. Some Christian Churches and evangelical bodies are actively engaged in proselytizing Christians already belonging to Orthodox Churches. All proselytism by any Church should be condemned, and all antagonism and unhealthy competition in mission work should be avoided, as constituting a distorted form of mission.

Unfortunately, well-financed resources and the power of the media in Western Europe and America, often play a key role in maintaining the unchristian missionary zeal of those involved in proselytizing efforts. The Orthodox Churches have to continue efforts to persuade those Churches and agencies involved in proselytism not to engage in dubious missionary activities detrimental to God's will for unity, and to seek the path of true Christian charity and unity.

At the same time, our Orthodox Churches have to give closer attention to the pastoral, educational and spiritual needs of our people and foster in every possible way a continual spiritual renewal in our parishes and monastic communities. It is especially important to develop ways of strengthening family life and caring for the special needs of youth that they might realize the communal love and concern of the Church for their well-being and salvation.

The ecumenical vision

One impetus for the modern ecumenical vision was originally inspired by the committed search for a common witness to the good news of salvation. It still remains the primary objective of our ecumenical involvement - to offer common witness in love to the power of Christ, crucified and risen, so that those who are caught up in this world of division, conflict and death may believe and be transfigured.

III. SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF SACRAMENTAL LIFE

The Sacramental Dimension of Life

In the sacrament-mysterion of the Church, human beings are restored to their proper relationship to God: to communion in Christ with God in the Holy Trinity. Through Baptism, Chrismation and Eucharist, persons receive a new birth in Christ, are anointed in the Spirit and are fully incorporated into the Body of Christ - the Church. The gift of this new life in Christ implies a commitment to the renewal of all of life, a conversion of mind and heart, so that God's will may be done, so that the world itself may be transformed and raised up by the witness and work of His children.

In Christ's life death and resurrection, all creation is restored and sanctified (cf. Eph. 1:10). Our life in Christ, therefore, must become a sacramental life, a life that continues the process of sanctifying all life and all time given to us as God's gift. The Church, in the fullness of this sacramental and diaconal life, is and manifests dynamically Christ's presence to the world. Thus,

as we participate in the Church's life, through fasting, prayer, the celebration of feasts and sacraments and active service to the poor, we renew ourselves and the entire cosmos, to the extent that our life conforms to Christ in the Holy Spirit.

The struggle to renew all things in God is a daily effort. It involves not merely individuals working for their own salvation, but the corporate work of persons seeking to unite all creation in communion with the living God. Such a life requires humility and sacrifice, self-emptying, the giving of ourselves to others in love and service, as the Lord gave himself up for us "for the life of the world." (John 6:51). It is life lived in community with others and for others. This is the ecclesial, sacramental reality of life in Christ.

The Eucharist and Renewal of Life

How is this sacramental life developed or nurtured today in the midst of a secular, broken, and suffering world? How can all things be united once again in the love and sovereignty of God's Kingdom?

For Orthodox Christians, the center and vivifying force of renewal is the Eucharist, where all persons and all creation are gathered together, lifted up, and united in the once-and-for-all offering of Christ himself. The Eucharist gives us not only the bread of life necessary for our spiritual sustenance and growth, but lifts up our hearts and minds, enabling us to see with a new vision the life that God has prepared for us from all eternity.

It is in the Eucharist that we come to know one another as members of one Body, united in the love of Christ in the image of the Holy Trinity. It is in and through this communion in the Spirit that we are given the strength and the power to fulfil Christ's mission in the world.

But this same Eucharist is also a judgment for Christians, for we may also partake of it "unto our judgment or condemnation" if this gift of communion is not personally appropriated and realized in our daily lives. We know that through our own weakness

and sin, we continue to deny God's love and power in the world. When we ignore the sufferings of our brothers and sisters, when we misuse the gifts of creation through pollution, destruction and waste of natural resources, we create new idols of and for ourselves. Isolated in egocentric self-will and self-indulgence, we cause our own spiritual death and that of our neighbors by indifference, conflict, division and lack of love. We also realize that amidst the joyful unity revealed and given to us within our own Church, the awareness of the continuing division of Christians saddens and challenges us.

Prayer and Repentance

Consequently, the Eucharist and the whole liturgical life of the Church calls us to prayer and repentance. Through our common prayer in the Church, we learn to pray personally, to offer glory and thanksgiving to God, to pray for ourselves and others, to consider the needs of the whole world, to keep one another alive in Christ through our remembrance of the sick and suffering, those in captivity and persecution, those who have departed this life before us, and especially the martyrs, saints and spiritual fathers and mothers whose witness provides an example for our lives, teaching us the true meaning of the words "Your Will be Done."

This prayer of Christ to the Father is a continual reminder of the need for repentance and forgiveness of sins. It is a call to re-examine our lives in the light of Christ's life. It is a call addressed personally to each of us for *metanoia* and conversion, a call to literally "turn around" our lives and recommit ourselves to Christ.

Witness and the Sacramental Life

Finally, for those who have strayed from the communion of the Church, as well as for those who have never experienced the newness of her life and joy, the sacraments and the entire life of the Church offer opportunities for witness to the truth about God and His relationship to us. Baptisms, marriages, visitations to the sick and dying, ordinations, funerals and rites of blessing, as

well as the actual diakonia of the Church in social concern and justice, provide unique occasions to proclaim God's message of hope, peace and joy in the crucified and resurrected Lord. It is at these moments, when lives are touched by joy or sorrow, suffering and compassion, that the truths about the ultimate questions of life can awaken minds and hearts to the love of God. It is at those times also that the best witness is the personal witness and presence of the Church, through the love and care of her members as a supportive community renewed in faith, love and freedom.

Only in this way, through a sacramental awareness and commitment to the world and a personal offering of ourselves to God, all His children, can we carry on Christ's mission in the world: that all may know "what is the breadth and length and height and depth of the love Christ so (that we) may attain to fullness of being, the fullness of God Himself" (Eph. 3:18-19).

IV. THE MISSIONARY IMPERATIVE AND RESPONSIBILITY IN THE LOCAL CHURCH

The Mission of the local Church

The mission of every one is to know Christ, to live in him and witness to him by word and deed. When our eucharistic assembly experiences this truth, the necessity to share the joy of the resurrection with all people is a natural consequence. The mission includes even those who though baptized, are as yet ignorant of the calling and election they have received through baptism. It is essential that contemporary means be developed to help them return to the fellowship of the Church. The Church's mission also calls us to the task of peacemaking, reconciling and defending justice for everyone, especially in contexts where the people of God suffer from injustice, violence, oppression and war. When the eucharistic assembly does not engage in such outreaches, it fails to realize its missionary responsibility.

Catholicity of the Local Church

According to Orthodox ecclesiology, the building up

(*oikodomé*) of the Body of Christ is an essential part of evangelization. Although there are normative forms of local communities, new forms of Christian communities may be necessary due to many social and cultural factors. In the process of building up new communities, the Church, through her Bishops, must be flexible in their creation.

The mission of the local Church suffers when its "catholic" dimension, its ecumenical openness, is not sufficiently underlined and expressed. The local community must not only pray for the oikoumene, but must be aware of the necessity to preach the Gospel to the whole world. It is the task of each local church to educate missionaries for this work wherever needed.

Some churches have already organized missionary departments to undertake the responsibility of sending missionaries. But the sending of missionaries is an ecclesiological act of establishing a concrete Christian presence in a given nation and culture. The indigenous Church must be assisted to develop its own identity and local structure as parts of a global fellowship. Every mission outreach should aim to create self-sufficient churches in fellowship with the whole Church.

Encouraging Various Ministries

The Church has always recognized the vocation of great missionaries and evangelists. She has also recognized the missionary vocation of the whole people of God, each member of the Body of Christ being called in and by the Holy Spirit to mission.

The local Bishop has the duty to identify, encourage, help and actualize various forms of lay ministry. The Church needs in its evangelistic work catechists, readers, preachers, chanters and all those who participate in the service of the Church. In lay movements and associations, the Church possesses an extraordinary missionary network for encouraging the participation of the people of God in mission: men, women, youth, scholars, workers and children.

In addition, monks and nuns may also find a special place in this great task, through prayer and ascetic witness.

Other Mission Challenges

- (1) The rise of various extremist Christian sects.
- (2) The dominating attitude of wealthy and powerful churches towards minority local churches.
- (3) The resurgence of other religions and various secular ideologies.
- (4) The disintegration of the family as the basic unit of church and society and problems resulting from broken families and single-parent situations.
- (5) The emergence of new cultures, which influence - positively or negatively - the spirituality of today's youth.
- (6) The search for a contemporary code of communication to transmit the message of eternal truth.

Recommendations to Orthodox Churches

The participants in this Consultation acknowledge the missionary involvement of their respective churches and the work already done in the mission field. With the following recommendations they aim to encourage the churches to continue, to enlarge and to enrich their missionary efforts all around the world for the sake of a most efficient evangelistic witness today.

- (1) That the missionary vocation must become a major concern and responsibility in the life of the Church and that special programs for mission awareness be organized for men, women and children in various walks of life to help them fulfil their missionary obligation.
- (2) That Christian education and catechetical material must incorporate the missionary imperative.
- (3) That theological schools and other educational institutions incorporate missiological studies in their programs, and the training and skills needed for mission.

- (4) That Orthodox institutes and training centers for mission be established to accept and prepare candidates for work in the mission field. That experienced and qualified Orthodox missionaries be utilized as teachers.
- (5) That the Church institute diaconal ministries, along with liturgical petitions and intercessions with emphasis on mission, for use in local parishes.
- (6) That special collections in every parish be offered for mission and that a special place be established for mission information and promotion.
- (7) That Associations or Friends of Missionaries be organized for moral and material support of those engaged in mission.
- (8) That regional forums be established for coordination, cooperation and sharing of the Orthodox mission resources of the various churches.
- (9) That Orthodox publications—especially translations—be utilized for the support of mission work.
- (10) That the Church renew the vocations of the deaconesses, catechists, readers, musicians and preachers for particular service in the mission field.
- (11) That the churches call monks and nuns to establish a monastic witness, in places where missions are being established, as spiritual centers.
- (12) That all churches set aside a special time each year for the promotion and support of missions.
- (13) That Orthodox Churches join with other Christian Churches in increasing their moral and financial support for the work of the World Council of Churches in general and the Commission on World Mission and Evangelism in particular.

Recommendations to the Ecumenical Community

- (1) That the Commission on World Mission and Evangelism of the World Council of Churches encourage and support young people in the study of missiology.

- (2) That all churches review and reflect upon their missionary programs in the light of their impact on the faithful of other churches to avoid mistakes or grievances that have occurred in the past and to prevent antagonism and competition in future mission work.
- (3) That through the CWME and related organizations educational programs be promoted to better inform members of all churches about the role of historic and present mission work of the Orthodox Churches.
- (4) That prior to, during and after the World Conference in San Antonio, May 22—June 1, 1989, delegates be encouraged to become informed about Orthodox mission activity in North America and elsewhere through study and visits.

An Appeal to the Readers

Dear Readers,

We are publishing **The Star of the East** under great financial difficulties. Increased postal rates have made it almost impossible to send the journal to readers abroad by air mail. Many people inside and outside the country are interested in this journal, but the return from subscriptions is incredibly low. There are no paid staff to run the periodical. We depend entirely on the goodwill of friends and well-wishers. We, therefore, appeal to you to send regularly your subscriptions and make a generous gesture to sustain this important publication.

for The Star of the East
Publisher

THE STAR OF THE EAST

THE STAR OF THE EAST is an Indian Orthodox ecumenical quarterly, published under the editorial responsibility of Metropolitan Dr. Paulos Mar Gregorios of Delhi. It is the continuation of an occasional journal carrying the same name originally published by the late Rev. Dr. C. T. Eapen of the Orthodox Syrian Church of India. The journal will deal with contemporary issues of ecumenism, especially from the perspective of the Orthodox Churches, and will carry news about the major events in the life of these Churches.

All correspondence, articles, news, exchange periodicals, books for review and subscription enquiries may be addressed to :

The Editor
The Star of the East
The Delhi Orthodox Centre
2, Tughlakabad Institutional Area
New Delhi-110 062

Single copy in India	Rs. 6.00
,, Outside India	\$ 1.00

Annual Subscription Rates :

In India	Rs. 20.00
Outside India (By Seamail)	\$ 6.00
(By Airmail)	\$ 8.00
For Indian Theological Students	Rs. 12.00

Life Subscription :

(In India)	Rs. 200.00
(Outside India)	\$ 1000.00